

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is in response to the Office Action having a mailing date of January 12, 2005. Claims 1-6 and 12-13 are pending in the present Application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 3, 4, and 12. Consequently, claims 1-6 and 12-13 remain pending in the present Application.

This application is under Final Rejection. Applicant has presented arguments hereinbelow that Applicant believes should render the claims allowable. In the event, however, that the Examiner is not persuaded by Applicant's arguments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the Amendment to clarify issues upon appeal.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to more clearly recite that the notch has a front and a back and the first and second portions of the gap are between the notch and the second pole. Support for the amendment can be found in Figures 2A, 2B, 4A, 4B, 5A, 5B, 6A, 6B, 7A, 7B, 8A, and 8B. Moreover, Applicant notes that the notch had already been recited as part of the pedestal. In addition, Applicant notes that claims 2-4 already recited pedestal defined zero throat write heads in which the portion of the gap over the front of the pedestal (notch) is thinner than the portion of the gap at the rear of the pedestal. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that in a pedestal-defined zero throat writer, the term "gap" generally applies to the region between the pedestal and the top pole, not to the region farther from the air-bearing surface than the pedestal. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that no new search is required and no new matter is added.

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 2-6 and 12 contain allowable subject matter.

Applicant has amended claims 2-4 and 12 to be in independent form, incorporating the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has also amended claims 2 and 4 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added and no new search is necessitated by the amendments to claims 2, 3, 4, and 12. Further, claims 5-6 depend upon claim 4. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-6 and 12 are allowable as currently presented.

In the above-identified Final Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings. In particular, the Examiner indicated that the notch in Figures 1B, 2B, 4B, 5B, 6B, 7B, and 8B be designated with a reference line drawn direction to the element. Applicant has provided substituted drawing sheets for Figures 1B, 2B, 4B, 5B, 6B, 7B, and 8B in which the reference line is drawn directly to a portion of the notch. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objection to the drawings has been addressed.

In the above-identified Final Office Action, the Examiner also objected to the specification. Applicant has amended the specification in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objection to the specification has been addressed.

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA).

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Claim 1 recites a pedestal defined zero throat write head in which the gap that separates the pedestal of the first pole from a portion of the second pole. A first portion of the gap is between the front of the notch and the second pole, while a second portion of the gap is between the back of the notch and the second

pole. Claim 1 further recites that the first portion of the gap is thinner than the second portion of the gap.

In contrast, AAPA describes writers in which the gap has a uniform thickness from front to back. As can be seen in the insulation defined zero throat writer of Figures 1A and 1B, the top of the pedestal, including the notch, is substantially flat. See items 54 (pedestal), 56 (notch), and gap 58. The bottom of the top pole is also substantially flat. See item 60 (top/second pole). Consequently, the gap has a relatively uniform thickness across the entire notch. Stated differently, the thickness of the gap at the front of the notch is substantially the same as the thickness of the gap at the back of the notch. As can be seen in the pedestal defined zero throat writer of Figures 2A and 2B, the gap between the notch and the second pole also has a relatively uniform thickness. See items 56 (notch), 58 (gap), and 60 (second pole). Thus, the AAPA fails to teach or suggest a pedestal defined zero throat writer in which the portion of the gap near the front of the writer is thinner than the portion of the gap at the rear of the notch. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over the AAPA.

Claim 13 depends upon claim 1. Consequently, the argument herein applies with full force to claim 13. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicant's attorney believes that this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

March 18, 2005
Date

/Janyce R. Mitchell/ Reg. No. 40,095
Janyce R. Mitchell
Reg. No. 40,095
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(650) 493-4540